

**HEADLINE:** War or Peace;

Political Wrap;

In Memoriam

**BYLINE:** ANCHOR: JIM LEHRER; GUESTS: HASAN RAHMAN; ALON PINKAS; MARK

SHIELDS;

DAVID BROOKS; JANET MASLIN; KEVIN LALLY; CORRESPONDENTS: KWAME HOLMAN;

RAY

SUAREZ; SPENCER MICHELS; MARGARET WARNER; GWEN IFILL; TERENCE SMITH;

KWAME

HOLMAN

**BODY:**

JIM LEHRER: Good evening. I'm Jim Lehrer. On the NewsHour tonight, a summary of today's news, including the latest from the Middle East, separate interviews with Palestinian and Israeli officials; a "what now?" report on raising campaign money; the analysis of Mark Shields and David Brooks; and some in memoriam images and thoughts about movie director Billy Wilder.

NEWS SUMMARY

JIM LEHRER: Israeli forces stormed Palestinian Leader Arafat's compound in the West Bank today. Tanks opened fire and knocked down walls, and soldiers went room-to-room, battling Arafat's bodyguards. Arafat was not injured. He took cover in an office without windows. Five Palestinians and one Israeli were killed. Hours earlier, Israeli Prime Minister Sharon declared Arafat an enemy. In Washington, Secretary of State Powell said Sharon assured him Arafat would not be harmed. Powell also said he told Arafat to stop the attacks on Israelis. And there was another suicide bombing today. A Palestinian teenager blew herself up outside a supermarket in Jerusalem, killing two people, injuring 20 others. We'll have more on the Middle East in a few minutes. The U.S. military is investigating a possible friendly fire death in Afghanistan. He was the first American soldier to die during Operation Anaconda on March 2. The US War Commander General Tommy Franks today said the serviceman was thought to have been killed by the enemy in the mountains near Gardez. But General Franks said he noticed a U.S. gunship reported striking enemy forces in the same place at the same time.

GEN. TOMMY FRANKS: It is not cloaking something when I say I really don't have a preliminary thought on it. It was significant enough, coincidental enough that I thought we better take a look at it, so we will eventually know what exactly happened. But the fact is that we are not ever going to be able to absolutely eradicate the loss of life, and in some cases, the loss of the wrong life, when we're engaged in this kind of operation.

JIM LEHRER: The case was part of an early report on friendly fire and civilian casualties released by the Defense Department. Not all the findings

Page 521

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

were made public. The U.S. Government soon could have enough smallpox vaccine for every American. Health and Human Services Secretary Thompson made the announcement today. A drug company, Aventis, agreed to donate about 90 million doses. They've been stored in freezers for several decades. If still effective, they'd be added to 15 million doses already on hand, and 200 million more now in production. Thompson spoke in Washington.

TOMMY THOMPSON: In the end, we'll have a larger stockpile of smallpox vaccine in the event of an outbreak of a biological terrorist attack. It is going to provide great security to all Americans. I do want to emphasize that the probability, however, of an intentional release of the smallpox virus is extremely low. But the risk does exist, and, therefore, we must be prepared.



JIM LEHRER: A British firm is to deliver the 200 million brand-new doses by the end of this year. Americans spent more as they earned more in February. The Commerce Department reported today both consumer spending and personal incomes went up 0.6% last month. Consumer spending accounts for about two-thirds of all U.S. economic activity. That's it for the News Summary tonight. Now it's on to the latest turns in the Middle East, post-campaign finance law, Shields and Brooks, and Billy Wilder's movie magic.

FOCUS - WAR OR PEACE

JIM LEHRER: The Israeli military offensive. Ray Suarez begins our coverage.

RAY SUAREZ: The Israeli assault on Palestinian Leader Yasser Arafat's Ramallah headquarters began early today. The move came after Israel's cabinet, in an emergency session last night, announced widespread action would be taken against Arafat's Palestinian Authority -- that, in response to the latest spate of suicide attacks that have left nearly 30 Israelis dead in three days.

ARIEL SHARON, Prime Minister, Israel (Translated): The government has approved principals for a plan for a wide military operation against the Palestinian terror. I want to tell you that in these very moments, the IDF forces are in the Mukataa, the center of Arafat's rule in Ramallah. Israel will operate to defeat the infrastructure of Palestinian terror and all its parts and components, and therefore will carry out wide activity until it reaches the goal. Arafat, who established a coalition of terror against Israel, is an enemy, and at this stage will be isolated. The government had approved recruiting of reservists as is required from the operational needs, in order to allow the IDF a continuous activity for an extended length of time and in additional terror centers.

RAY SUAREZ: Today, after Israeli tanks and bulldozers flattened the gates and shelled the walls surrounding Arafat's sprawling West Bank compound, Israeli troops stormed several buildings inside, including the one where the Palestinian leader was hiding. Gun battles erupted between Arafat's security guards and Israeli soldiers. Five Palestinians and one Israeli soldier were killed. At least 25 of Arafat's guards were wounded. During the Israeli offensive, Arafat huddled with his closest advisers in a windowless ground floor hideout. In a telephone interview with al Jazeera Television, he said he would rather die a martyr than be arrested or forced into exile by Israel. Arafat also said millions of Palestinian martyrs are headed to Jerusalem. And it wasn't long before there was a suicide bombing in the holy city. A teenage girl blew herself

Page 522

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

up at the entrance to a supermarket, killing two people and wounding at least 20 others. Elsewhere in Jerusalem, Israeli security forces stormed the al Aqsa mosque compound, firing tear gas and using stun grenades to disperse stone-throwing Muslim worshippers. In Washington, Secretary of State Colin Powell said Israeli Prime Minister Sharon had promised him Arafat would not be harmed. Secretary Powell also said it was the recent Palestinian terrorist attacks on Israel civilians that ended recent progress in peace negotiations.

COLIN POWELL: That's what has caused this crisis to come upon us, not the absence of a political way forward, but terrorism in its rawest form. We have spoken out clearly and do so again now, for Chairman Arafat to act, act against those responsible for these acts, and to make clear to the Palestinian people that terror and violence must halt now. All those who support peace must reinforce this message. While we understand the Israeli government need to respond to these acts of terror and the right of the Israeli government to decide what actions best serve the interest of the Israeli people, we call on Prime Minister Sharon and his government to carefully consider the consequences

of those actions. Chairman Arafat is the leader of the Palestinian people, and his leadership is now even more central to trying to find a way out of this tragic situation.

RAY SUAREZ: The Secretary said that U.S. Envoy Anthony Zinni would remain in the region and continue talking with both sides.

JIM LEHRER: Now to the official Palestinian position, and to Margaret Warner.

MARGARET WARNER: And with me is **Hasan Abdel Rahman**, the Palestine National Authority's chief representative to Washington. Mr. Rahman, I understand you've spoken to Yasser Arafat in the last hour or so. What did he say?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** Well, he's in a very good and high morale. He believes that he is the fighter for the cause of the Palestinian people. He realizes that there is an aggression committed or being committed by Israel against him personally, and against all of the Palestinian people; he is one of the Palestinian people -- these 3.4 million Palestinians who live under one of the most brutal military occupations in history.

MARGARET WARNER: Give us a sense of where he is. I understand this compound is about a city block big and he is in one particular building. Is he still in this windowless office that he was described as being in earlier today?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** Believe me, I did not talk to him about where he is. We spoke about other issues. But he informed me of his high morale and of his attempts to speak to other leaders around the world. He is being contacted by many people at this moment, by the Europeans, by Arab leaders, by Palestinian leaders, to give support and express their condemnation of Israeli attack against him and against Ramallah and the Palestinian people.

MARGARET WARNER: Secretary Powell said as you know, that Ariel Sharon assured him that Mr. Arafat is not a target either to be killed or to be expelled. Does Mr. Arafat still feel he is a target?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** With all due respect to Secretary Colin Powell, I don't see how can he believe first of all or trust Mr. Sharon. We remember all what

Page 523

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

happened in 1982 -- how Mr. Sharon lied to his prime minister and to the Israeli cabinet and he was reprimanded for that. Mr. Sharon is a liar. He cannot be trusted.

MARGARET WARNER: I guess what I'm asking -

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** And let me just continue because when you use cannons and tanks to attack a civilian compound, you can kill somebody by accident.

MARGARET WARNER: I see. So the fact that they-- if they really wanted to kill Arafat, they already could have, could they not?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** The operation is not over yet. As I was talking to President Arafat, Israeli tanks were firing on his compound. What is there in Arafat's compound to use so many tanks to attack it? I mean I was honestly disappointed with the statement made by Colin Powell because we respect Mr. Colin Powell. But I wonder how he allows even himself to accept that the elected leader of another people be attacked by the army of an occupying nation without outrage from the United States and from Mr. Colin Powell personally.

MARGARET WARNER: Sharon said himself that he wanted to isolate Mr. Arafat. What do you take that to mean, and has he succeeded in further weakening Mr. Arafat's hold, essentially, on the Palestinian National Authority, on Palestinian security forces, or is Arafat still in charge?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** This is an outrageous statement, Margaret. How would even I consider what Mr. Sharon says, to isolate Yasser Arafat? Yasser Arafat is the elected leader of the Palestinian people. He is respected, recognized by 180 nations around the world. What lie does Mr. Sharon, who made a career of being a

terrorist, have to isolate Mr. Yasser Arafat? That should be the question. And I am amazed that there is not enough outrage guess against this action, reckless action by Sharon, dangerous action, which puts not only the future of peace between the Palestinians and the Israelis in danger, but the whole stability of the region.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Let's talk about terrorism because you brought that up and Sharon of course, brought that up today saying as he said before, that Arafat runs a coalition of terror, that they're going in to root out this infrastructure. Are you saying that even though some of the groups that have done some of these attacks such as the al Aqsa brigades are tied to Fatah, PLO's military wing, that Arafat has no control, no ability to rein in any of the attacks?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** Margaret, you and I know that terrorism was introduced to our region by no other than the Israeli leaders. You remember that two of the Israelis first prime ministers, Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, were both wanted by the British for assassination of the international mediator. So we know who introduced terrorism to the region. Now there are certain Palestinians who are involved in acts of violence that we reject, but there is a difference of having one individual Palestinian acting violently and when terrorism becomes the policy of the state of Israel.

MARGARET WARNER: Are you saying, though, that terrorism is in no way the policy of the Palestinians?

Page 524

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** Absolutely not. On the contrary, we have condemned. We have tried to contain it, but you cannot isolate what happens from the overall context that is created by Israel. Remember that for 35 years, the Palestinian people are living under the most brutal illegal military occupation, to use the words of Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. And this occupation sucked life out of the Palestinians, left them hopeless, desperate, poor, destitute, and they live under a state of siege by the Israelis.

MARGARET WARNER: So are you saying--.

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** I'm saying that Mr. Sharon and the Israeli policies are responsible for pushing those young Palestinians to become terrorists.

MARGARET WARNER: And therefore, is your answer to Secretary Powell who even today called on Yasser Arafat to go after the terrorist attackers, that there is nothing that can be done?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** Unfortunately Mr. Colin Powell is missing the point. He should point fingers to Mr. Sharon to move his soldiers, his army, his settlers, from the Palestinian territories. And I assure you that we are not going to follow them across the green line. We will be able then to live in peace with a state of Israel next to the state of Palestine. But let me tell you what. As long as the Israeli illegal military occupation continues in the Palestinian territories and as long as we have those Jewish Talibans settlers in the Palestine, 300,000 of them, the most extreme coming from Brooklyn and New York and other places to settle in the Palestinian territories, we cannot expect to have peace. Peace can be achieved only when those guys leave us alone and leave us as a free people.

MARGARET WARNER: So are you predicting more suicide bombings?

**HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN:** If this situation continues, if the occupation continues, if the brutality of the Israeli army, the killing of Palestinian young people, the imprisonment of Palestinians, the humiliation of the Palestinians, no one can stop the Palestinians. The only one to stop the violence is to eliminate the causes of violence and the cause of violence is the illegal military occupation.

MARGARET WARNER: Mr. Rahman, thank you very much.

HASAN ABDEL RAHMAN: Thank you very much.

JIM LEHRER: Now to Ray Suarez for the official Israeli position.

RAY SUAREZ: Joining us is Alon Pinkas, the Israeli Consul General in New York.

Mr. Pinkas, what is the objective of the current Israeli military move in the territories?

ALON PINKAS: The objective, sir, is to do what Mr. Arafat took upon himself in the various commitments he has made and the vows he has taken and to rout out the terrorists, to dismantle, obliterate and destroy the terrorist infrastructure that Mr. Arafat himself has, for the last year and a half at least, been harboring and directly and deeply supporting, and to possibly get to Page 525

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

the-- to as much ammunitions and armaments as possible. The second objective, which is political, is to signal to Mr. Arafat that his own political survival is at stake here, if he hasn't gotten that message until now. And the third objective is to isolate him so as not to incite, so as not to galvanize his people with these out of the planet speeches he has made in the last year and a half, speeches that have unfortunately contributed to the political culture, this maniac, maniacal political culture of homicidal and suicidal bombers.

RAY SUAREZ: If he is, as you say, isolated, how can he be an instrument or in any way affect the future, the near term future of stopping the violence in the West Bank and Gaza?

ALON PINKAS: Well, I don't know that he is instrumental in doing that. And I beg to differ with anyone who seriously believes that he remains central to that objective. This is a man who has lied most of the time to most of the people and then all of the time to all of the people for the last seven years. But we still believed him and then again for the last year and a half ever since Camp David. I don't know that he has the ability. I don't know that he has the capabilities, but more importantly, I don't think that he has the will to quell down the extremist elements in the Palestinian-- in Palestinian society, or, for that matter, the mainstream elements in the Palestinian Authority who have become no less involved in terror. This is a man who has branded suicide and homicidal bombers as role models for the Palestinian people -- not philosophers, not poets, not statesmen but suicide bombers, 18-year-old drugged and doped idiots who blow themselves up in pizza parlors. This is the political culture we need to contend. It is not different from al Qaeda; it is not different from Hezbollah. It is not different from all those violent terror organizations that sprung up from the shortcomings and deficiencies of Arab political culture.

RAY SUAREZ: Over the years, your government and previous Israeli governments have called Arafat a partner for peace. Today-- well yesterday Prime Minister Sharon referred to him as the enemy. But Colin Powell said his leadership is central to finding a way out. Can he be both those things at the same time?

ALON PINKAS: I concede to you that it sounds some irreconcilable. But look, Colin Powell looks at it from the vantage point of the Secretary of State of the United States of America. Colin Powell also knows that Thomas Jefferson is not going to replace Arafat, which is why we may be stuck with the man we know rather than the devil that we don't know. But I think that Colin Powell has a very thorough knowledge and familiarity with the subject matter, and he would tell you that it is very, very doubtful whether or not Arafat could still play a useful role in destroying this terrorist infrastructure. He, after all, help set it up.

RAY SUAREZ: Does Israel want him out of the occupied areas, expelled from the

region?

ALON PINKAS: It's almost an irrelevant question, sir. I mean whether we want him out or not almost doesn't make a difference. The people who should really drive him out are the Palestinians, to which he delivered nothing but poverty and hopelessness and misery and tragedy again and again and again. These are all self-inflicted tragedies. This has nothing do with the so-called occupation. This is a man who has not, and I'm sorry to use the clich again, who has not missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity ever since he came into the

Page 526

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

political scene. Whether he is expelled or not is almost immaterial. The Palestinians need to take a hard look at what their leadership provided them with, what their leadership is providing-- what kind of future their leadership is going to provide them with, and they should be the ones deposing him. At the end of the day, looking back, you're right. We did regard him as a partner for peace for many, many years since 1993. It was difficult for us to-- it was almost unpalatable to us in the beginning, but we still maintained-- even though there were hardships and obstacles, we still maintained that he is the trustworthy partner. We have reached an almost irreversible conclusion that this man has undoubtedly outlived his usefulness as a political partner. We don't see any way we can move forward with this man-- I'm talking politics here-- with this man in the future. And a political course of action is imperative here, be there no doubt.

RAY SUAREZ: Well, whether or not the Palestinians move against his leadership, right now Israeli army tanks and our guest just before you Mr. Rahman said that in the past hour, you could still hear shells hitting the compound. They're in control of the area and would seem to have, in the near term, a lot to say about Yasser Arafat's fate.

ALON PINKAS: I'm sorry. Who has a lot to say about his fate?

RAY SUAREZ: The Israeli army.

ALON PINKAS: Yes, but we are not out to get him. We are a democracy. We do not depose the leader. I heard Mr. Abdul Rahman describe a few minutes ago, Arafat the elected leader. He also never lost an election which puts him in line with the great statesmen of our error, Colonel Qaddafi and Saddam Hussein of Iraq. Having said that, we are not in the business of deposing of him, expelling him or eliminating him all together. Yes, we're in the region, but this compound that you are talking about-- in the regional confines of his compound I mean, but that compound consists of ten buildings. We are not out to get Mr. Arafat personally.

RAY SUAREZ: Will those troops leave that area once they achieve their objective? What happens next?

ALON PINKAS: Well, what happens next is that we will-- there are tactical military moves all of which derive from the political objective. The political objective is to turn the Palestinian Authority into a militia-free entity. To tell you that we can 100% have guaranteed success here, I cannot. However, we will stay there, from a military tactical point of view, as long as necessary. It could be a few days, it could be a few weeks. I don't expect it to be more than that. And hopefully we will rout out as many terrorists as we can. We will disarm as many as we can. And we will apprehend as many as we can. Incidentally, all those that we seek are people that have been on wanted lists that were submitted to Arafat time and time again by Israel, through the American envoys in the last several years, through European envoys. He has done nothing to apprehend them. Some of them, incidentally, have blown themselves up killing innocent Israeli children in the process.

RAY SUAREZ: Consul General Pinkas, thank you for being with us.

ALON PINKAS: Thank you.

Page 527

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

JIM LEHRER: Still to come on the NewsHour tonight, Now what on campaign finance, Shields and Brooks, and the movie art of Billy Wilder.

UPDATE - SETTING LIMITS

JIM LEHRER: Kwame Holman reports on the impact of that new campaign finance law. ( Cheers and applause )

KWAME HOLMAN: In a single night during the 2000 election year, the democratic party collected \$26 million in unregulated-- so- called soft money-- contributions from wealthy donors at a Washington gala. Some individuals gave hundreds of thousands each.

SPOKESMAN: We don't care what's in your wallets, we care about what's in your hearts.

KWAME HOLMAN: The donations have come to dominate political funding.

SPOKESMAN: My friend and yours, George W. Bush.

KWAME HOLMAN: Days earlier, in Washington, then-candidate George W. Bush helped collect \$21 million in soft money from a small number of donors for the Republican Party. But on Wednesday, President Bush quietly signed into law the death warrant for soft money collected by the political parties. The new campaign finance law bans national parties from collecting soft money. The ban begins in November. Starting then, contributions to the parties will be limited to \$2,000 per donor. From a headquarters near the Capitol Building, Terry McAuliffe runs the Democratic National Committee.

SPOKESMAN: Any good action?

SPOKESMAN: Lots of it.

SPOKESMAN: Good. Dennis, how we doing? Ready to beat some Republicans?

KWAME HOLMAN: As the party's main political and fundraising operation, the Democratic National Committee is preparing to live without the large, unregulated contributions from individual donors, which totaled \$100 million for the DNC during the last election.

TERRY McAULIFFE, Chairman, Democratic National Committee: I knew this thing was going to happen, so we have been working very hard here to build a small donor base to the party. It took the DNC 20 years, from 1980 to 2000, to get 400,000 direct mail donors. Just last year we went from 400,000 to 850,000 just in one year. Our e-mail addresses in one year have gone from 70,000 to 780,000, so we have been working very hard in here. We're going to make up that \$100 million, we're going to do it with federal money, and we're going to do it with small donors.

KWAME HOLMAN: McAuliffe, like most Democrats in Congress, favors the soft money ban, against the general opposition of Republicans.

TERRY McAULIFFE: It's the right thing. I mean, it will take politics back to the grass roots. It will get big money out; it will get a lot more people

Page 528

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

involved in the system. It will get... force us as a political party to go out and get a lot more smaller checks, which is the right thing.

KWAME HOLMAN: Three blocks away at Republican national committee headquarters, McAuliffe's counterpart, Marc Racicot, suggested why members of congress finally voted to ban large, unregulated donations.

MARC RACICOT, Chairman, Republican National Committee: There was an appearance problem. I'm not certain that there was a real problem, but there certainly was an appearance problem, and I can tell you, having been a candidate

and an officeholder, that you are particularly sensitive to these perceptions.

KWAME HOLMAN: Like the Democrats, Republicans mostly purchased election-year TV ads with their soft money, but it funded other campaign activities as well, and Racicot says its loss be felt.

MARC RACICOT: It will diminish the capacity, quite frankly, of the national parties and local state parties to be as active as they have been in the past.

SPOKESMAN: Clay Colder in Georgia has posted \$680,000. Which is good. And that's an open seat, so we have a good chance of winning that seat.

KWAME HOLMAN: Upstairs in the same building, political operatives for Republicans in the House of Representatives geared up for this year's congressional races. Unlike the democrats, Republicans long have maintained a list of donors who can afford to contribute up to the new \$2,000 limit that arrives next November. But congressional committee legal counsel Don McGahn says such contributions, known as hard money, won't fill the gap left by the ban on unlimited soft money.

DON McGAHN, National Republican Congressional Committee: That supposes that we've been sandbagging on our fundraising, that somehow there is all this hard money out there that we haven't raised, and now that you've banned soft, we're going to miraculously find new money. I don't think there is new hard money out there. We simply will not have the same kind of funds that we currently have. And we will not be able to get the Republican message out in a way that we have in the past handful of elections, at least. It certainly will cause irreparable harm to the party committees, and that's Republicans and democrats.

KWAME HOLMAN: Across town, the coming ban on soft money was met with smiles at the headquarters of Common Cause, one of the advocacy groups that lobbied for the ban for years. Chief lobbyist Meredith McGehee:

MEREDITH McGEHEE, Common Cause: Who this legislation favors are average Americans that don't have the ability to go out and give \$1 million in one day as a soft money contribution, as we've seen under the current system. I think this is a system that will favor the party that most nimbly and quickly understands that you're rewarded for involving people and the grassroots as part of your political party, and not become, as the parties are essentially right now, soft money Laundromats.

SPOKESMAN: You want money?

KWAME HOLMAN: The political parties also use the large, unregulated

Page 529

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

contributions to help fund their congressional candidates, so the coming soft money ban will cut off a potential source of campaign revenue. To help congressional candidates compensate, the new law doubles the \$1,000 limit on contributions the candidates collect on their own. Maryland Democratic Congressman Albert Wynn opposed the soft money ban because it could hurt the party's efforts to increase minority voter participation. He says increasing the contribution limit for congressional candidates also has a downside.

REP. ALBERT WYNN: Well, it puts a premium on individual contributors who can contribute large amounts of money, up to \$2,000. This bill certainly hasn't helped the poor, the working class individuals. It's probably reduced their clout. It's increased significantly the clout of the professional cadre in this country.

SPOKESPERSON: Marge Roukema, too taxing - too liberal--

KWAME HOLMAN: The other major provision of the new law tries to broadcast attack ads run against congressional and presidential candidates. It requires disclosure of the ad's sponsors and limits on their funding. But that provision could be struck down by the courts, leaving candidates at the mercy of attack

ads.

REP. ALBERT WYNN: I think the courts will strike down the provisions of the law that affect third parties independent groups, special interest groups from participating with advertising and the like. On the other hand, I think the restrictions against the other political parties will remain in effect.

KWAME HOLMAN: For now, both parties are likely to raise unregulated political money up to the November deadline.

FOCUS - POLITICAL WRAP

JIM LEHRER: To the analysis of Shields and Brooks; syndicated columnist Mark Shields and David Brooks of the "Weekly Standard." Mark, what did you think of the way the President signed that campaign finance law into law?

MARK SHIELDS: We don't know that he signed it, Jim. All that we have is the word of Dick Cheney and Condi Rice who were in the office at the time.

JIM LEHRER: Very early in the morning - like 7:00.

MARK SHIELDS: That's right.

JIM LEHRER: No big pens and all of that, people standing behind him, any of that, No John McCain -

MARK SHIELDS: No John McCain.

JIM LEHRER: -- no Chris Shays.

MARK SHIELDS: No Marty Meehan or Chris Feingold. It reminded me, Jim of when John Warner first ran for the United States Senate in Virginia, there was a very controversial issue, and it was about the equal rights amendment and whether the time that was running out on the ratification of it ought to be extended. And

Page 530

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

his Democratic opponent, Warner's Democratic opponent said he was for the equal rights amendment but against extending the time, thus effectively alienating both sides of the argument, those who were against the amendment and those who were for it. What President Bush did was essentially displease both sides. He displeased obviously those like Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House who said this was Armageddon for the Republicans and the big majority of Republicans on the Hill who did not want him to sign the law, and he displeased the Democrats, the reformers who had fought seven years for this, including John McCain. And his self-portrait as sort the conciliator and the man who brought civility and bipartisanship, I thought took a little bit of a hit by this stealth performance.

JIM LEHRER: What did you think?

DAVID BROOKS: I basically agree with that. My theory is that they put a clothespin on his nose while he was asleep; they put the pen in his hand, and they sort of moved the paper under it so he wouldn't be morally tainted by signing the thing. He came across looking unprincipled and cynical because if he was for it, he should have signed it in the proper manner. If he was against it, he should have vetoed it. I agree - the way he did it just made him look Machiavellian.

JIM LEHRER: Yeah. Let's go to the news of this day, the Middle East. Do you share the sense that the only the United States can prevent this thing from getting worse than it is now?

DAVID BROOKS: I don't think we can now. I think what's happened is that it used to be about land for peace. But after Arafat walked out of Camp David, people on the Palestinian side okay, we are thought going to have peace soon but some day we are going to have everything we want. So they pushed back their mental time frame and then they maximalized their demands. And then it became -- from a land-for-peace conflict, it became an existential conflict. And then what happened was the suicide bombers took over. I really think the suicide bombers,

which are a weapon, have transformed the whole culture of the Middle East because the suicide bombers and the passions they arouse of martyrdom and vengeance, of murder, of religious purity are just more powerful than the passions of politics, of negotiations, and give and take. And I think the care and nurturing and celebration on television of suicide bombers has been like a narcotic, an addiction that has transformed the situation, which will have to burn off until we can get back to where it was before, which was a negotiation between two people fighting over the same piece of land.

JIM LEHRER: And, Mark, President Bush and his folks have been reluctant to get really involved in this till now. But do you agree with David that even if they wanted to now, that things have to calm down, things have to move on, on their own before we can do anything, we meaning the United States of America?

MARK SHIELDS: I don't know, Jim. I'd say if there were an identifiable United States policy, I would say it was in tatters. I don't think there has been one.

It was the anti-Clinton policy. There was a hands-off laissez-faire removed and it has been a disaster. It has been a total disaster. And I think if we stand exposed, this particular week, after requesting the Sharon government to allow Yasser Arafat to travel to the Arab conference, that we stand exposed as powerless and without influence in the Israeli government. And everybody knows

Page 531

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

the special relationship between the United States and Israel, the fact that you know, we've given over \$90 billion in foreign aid to Israel -- more than any other nation -- and that we have been its staunchest supporter and ally. And so I think right now where I might disagree with David is this: that if anything is going to be done by the United States, it is going to require the direct involvement of perhaps both the Secretary of State and the President.

JIM LEHRER: Is that likely to happen, David?

DAVID BROOKS: I think it is now. I think today was an important day, and especially Colin Powell's press conference today, because I thought the Administration recovered the moral gyroscope it had lost for two weeks. And we had gotten in a world where we were excusing terror, minimizing terror, rewarding Yasser Arafat by trying to meet with him, trying to get him up to Beirut for the conference because of the terror. But what Bush and Colin Powell said today was that, you know, for a little while we sort of thought that Yasser Arafat was a constructive force in the Middle East. Now we have gone back to our original position, which is that he is not going to be a constructive force and Colin Powell essentially gave the green light to Israel today.

JIM LEHRER: You think he did?

DAVID BROOKS: I think that's how it certainly is perceived on both sides of the issue; that he basically said we understand Israel does what it needs to do and I think they understand that you can't fight terror around the world while sort of being morally neutral about it in the Middle East.

JIM LEHRER: Do you see it the same way?

MARK SHIELDS: I didn't. I didn't see it that way. Now maybe I missed some nuance there. Jim, I have to say that this week, you know, I don't know what Yasser Arafat's argument is the case to be made for him, but when the policy of Israel and the Sharon government has been to emasculate, to humiliate, to marginalize Arafat, which they have done, and then to hold him accountable for not being a strong, forceful, dominant commanding leader, I mean it is an impossible demand to place upon anybody, regardless how you feel about Yasser Arafat. And I really think that that is sort of the reality we're stuck with and struck with this week. I don't think that-- I did not get the sense that there was an endorsement of any kind of carte blanche on the part of the Israelis.

JIM LEHRER: In fact--

MARK SHIELDS: By the United States.

JIM LEHRER: He said Sharon, Prime Minister Sharon should keep in mind the impact of what he is doing, what the Israeli government is doing.

MARK SHIELDS: That's right.

JIM LEHRER: And you read that as an equal signal to both sides.

MARK SHIELDS: I do. This is the first administration and I think it is to be commended, to declare unequivocally that it supported the creation of an independent Palestinian state. But then having made that lofty goal part of its

Page 532

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

policy, it walked away. To achieve the conditions that are necessary on both sides across the board, it is going to require long hours, great details, great detailed, tough work and right now up until now, this administration has not shown the willingness to make that kind of a commitment.

JIM LEHRER: The other point that was made, been made two or three times in the last week on this program by various folks, is that it is impossible to look upon this in just an issue thing now or terrorist versus these terrorist governments or whatever, because of the hostility, the hatred that Sharon as an individual has for Arafat and vice versa, and that until that is off the table, very little else gets on the table.

DAVID BROOKS: The problem is the Israeli government used to be split. The Israeli population used to be split. That's no longer true. We are living in a post-Oslo world where after Arafat walked out of Camp David, the Israelis felt suckered. They felt we gave these people rifles and now they're using us to shoot at us.

JIM LEHRER: I know. But I'm just talking about today. I'm talking about what it is going to take to get from here to there and these two men have no motivation, at least that's what our guests have been saying all week from both sides.

DAVID BROOKS: Or the people. They do represent their people.

MARK SHIELDS: I think David made a key point. There has been a sea change and the sea change is this in my judgment. The last Intifada in 1987, there were 25 Palestinian deaths, casualties, for every one of the Israelis. Now, I mean 75-80% of the casualties are suffered by the Palestinians but it is a three to one ratio. And I think what we have seen is a sea change in the sense that on the part of those most militant on the Palestinian side, that time and history are on their side, and that they're willing to absorb this and that it has led to a more profound and more serious change in Israel and the way Israelis live, and the fear that grips so much of their lives, and I don't know how that plays out politically, but it is a major, major factor in the political equation at this point.

DAVID BROOKS: The other thing that happened was the suicide bombers are no longer Hamas and Islamic Jihad. They're al Aqsa, they're Fatah, they're people directly connected to Yasser Arafat. That's why I'm saying suicide bombing has taken over the conflict. There's not a weapon in the conflict that has taken over the conflict. So to talk about the casualties on both sides, to me they're unequal casualties. One is terrorist casualties, the other is efforts, crude, sometimes efforts to combat terrorism. And I don't say that as you know this radical - type person. If it was up to me, hundreds of the settlements would be gone tomorrow but I think we have to acknowledge it is not a parallel situation - that one side really did at Camp David made a brave offer for peace. The other side rejected it and we are living in the shambles of the death of the Oslo process.

JIM LEHRER: Does that mean the Clinton Administration dropped the ball?

MARK SHIELDS: I don't think, no. I think you have to be a pretty narrow and pretty petty partisan at this point to criticize Bill Clinton for the efforts

Page 533

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

they made. I mean they came that close. And Ehud Barak bet his political career on it, a public career, a great Israeli hero as prime minister, cost him the election. There is no question. Yasser Arafat turned down the greatest opportunity for peace and Palestinian autonomy ever presented. I think Bill Clinton will earn history's gratitude and admiration for what he did.

JIM LEHRER: What do you make of Sharon's statement the other day that the real problem here between the United States and Israel is that the United States is trying to get people together to take action against Iraq, and Israel is trying to get together to take action against the Palestinian terrorists?

MARK SHIELDS: Well, I don't think there is any question that Dick Cheney's trip was a failure. I mean he went over there to organize a coalition against Iraq. While he got there, he found out there was no appetite for it, no enthusiasm for it and there was a great concern about Israel and the Palestinians, and the trouble that that meant throughout the entire Arab world as they saw it. And at that point, the United States became engaged. So there is the question about how deeply are we involved? How deeply are we committed?

JIM LEHRER: Quick closing.

DAVID BROOKS: Basically I agree with that. During the Cheney trip we got ourselves wrapped around the Tenet, Mitchell, and all of that - all the moral clarity that Bush started this war with was gone. And that moral clarity I think really did return today.

JIM LEHRER: We had three other things we were going to talk about -- we'll do it next week, I promise. Thank you.

FINALLY - IN MEMORIAM

JIM LEHRER: Finally tonight, the work of Billy Wilder. Terence Smith reports.

TERENCE SMITH: Billy Wilder, one of Hollywood's greatest writer-directors, made more than 50 films in his prolific career.

ACTRESS: Mr. Demille, I'm ready for my close-up.

TERENCE SMITH: In 1950, he challenged Hollywood's comfort zone with his dark satire "Sunset Boulevard." Wilder's portrayal of an aging film star with delusions about her former fame earned him the Oscar for best screenplay.

ACTOR: The audience left 20 years ago, now face it.

ACTRESS: It's a lie. They still want me?

ACTOR: No they don't.

ACTRESS: What about the studio, what about Demille?

ACTOR: He was trying to spare your feelings.

TERENCE SMITH: Wilder, known to his friends as a cynic and a romantic, focused his films on human frailties-- especially greed.

Page 534

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

JACK LEMMON: ("The Apartment") I have my own office now. You may be interested to know I'm the second youngest executive in this country. The only one younger is the grandson of the chairman of the board.

TERENCE SMITH: In "The Apartment," Jack Lemmon played a corporate climber trying to impress Shirley MacLean's character. The film brought Wilder a first: Three Academy Awards for best screenplay, best director, and best film.

JACK LEMMON: I used to live like Robinson Caruso, shipwrecked among eight million people and one day I saw a footprint in the sand and there you were.

TERENCE SMITH: Born in Galicia in what is today Poland, and raised in

Austria, Wilder fled Germany ahead of the nazis and came to the U.S. in 1934. He mastered English and became one of Hollywood's craftsman. The range of his films was extraordinary.

JACK LEMMON: This may even turn out to be a surprise party.

MARILYN MONROE: What is the surprise?

JACK LEMMON: Not yet.

MARILYN MONROE: When?

JACK LEMMON: Better have a drink first.

MARILYN MONROE: That will put hair on your chest.

JACK LEMMON: No fair guessing.

TERENCE SMITH: In his 1959 slapstick "Some Like it Hot," which became an immediate classic, Wilder again teamed with Lemmon, who spent much of the film in drag opposite Marilyn Monroe.

MARILYN MONROE: I had no idea you were such a big girl.

JACK LEMMON: You should have seen me before I went on a diet.

TERENCE SMITH: His darker films included "Lost Weekend," a brutally realistic depiction of an alcoholic, which won him Oscars for writing and directing.

ACTOR: Come on, man, join me. One jigger of dreams, huh?

ACTOR: No thanks.

TERENCE SMITH: And "Double Indemnity," a 1944 account of a murder scheme gone awry.

HUMPHRE BOGART: Never resist an impulse, Sabrina, especially if it is terrible.

TERENCE SMITH: Among his comedies, "Sabrina," starring Audrey Heyburn and Humphrey Bogart.

Page 535

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

MARILYN MONROE: Do you feel the breeze from the subway? Isn't it delicious?

TERENCE SMITH: And "The Seven-Year Itch," with Marilyn Monroe. In addition to his six Oscars, Wilder received the Irving Thalberg Memorial award at the 1988 academy awards.

BILLY WILDER: As I look back in life, I've lived a charmed life. I never expected something like this.

TERENCE SMITH: Two nights ago, in Beverly Hills, Billy Wilder died of pneumonia. He was 95.

TERENCE SMITH: And joining me now are Janet Maslin, the former movie critic for the "New York Times"-- she is now a book critic with the paper; and Kevin Lally, author of "Wilder Times: The Life of Billy Wilder." He is the managing editor of "Film Journal International," a monthly. Welcome to you both.

Janet Maslin, when you look back on this extraordinary career, what defines Billy Wilder as a filmmaker for you?

JANET MASLIN: Well, the interesting thing to me is that it took such a long time for him to be acknowledged as the great director that he was, that he spent a lot of his career as a kind of stealth genius. He-- the unifying things in his films was that mostly they were very good, they were very entertaining, they made money, they brought out the best in the actors who were in them. But somehow when he was doing his best work, this was generally not thought to be-- these were not the attributes of a great director. It took a long time for his reputation to catch up with him.

TERENCE SMITH: But it did?

JANET MASLIN: It finally did, but really only, I think really only in recent years.

TERENCE SMITH: Kevin Lally, what you look back at this and you see the extraordinary range of these films, and you see the dark and you see the light,

was there a thread that tied those two things together, those two aspects of his personality?

KEVIN LALLY: Well, I think it he was not at all afraid of being a groundbreaker. In the 40s, there is a remarkable string of films that broke a lot of barriers. When you think of "Lost Weekend" and its serious portrait of alcoholism and "Double Indemnity", which was an essential film noir and a film that dared to have two lead characters plotting a murder. This was pretty extreme for its day -- and a film that's kind of overlooked called "A Foreign Affair" which is a farce set in bombed out post-war Berlin. He was a very, very audacious film maker from the very beginning and a great groundbreaker.

JANET MASLIN: And one of the things he dared to do was make each film different from what he had done before so you didn't really identify Wilder hallmarks. It was a certain level of quality that united them but he never tried to repeat what he had done.

TERENCE SMITH: Janet Maslin, tell us also what a director does in a film, and Page 536

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002  
what a director did in his era as opposed to today.

JANET MASLIN: Well, director is kind of the conductor who hires and fires everybody in the orchestra, and in his case, writes the music, too, because he was the writer, co-writer of many of his films. But if you take a story like "The Apartment" where have you two people working for a company and they're both being really ill-used in a kind of sordid way by this company, that could be a sad story, it could be a bawdy comedy, it could be a romantic story, it could be any number of things. And what he did in that case was to make it all three. But that's what the director does, really, is to shape it and steer it overall.

TERENCE SMITH: Kevin Lally?

KEVIN LALLY: Well, if you look at "The Apartment," it is considered, I believe the American film institute voted it one of the top 25 comedies of all time but has a suicide attempt in the middle of the film, a very devastating suicide attempt. Or you look at a film like "Some Like it Hot," which is one of the great, great film farces but it's a farce propelled by the St. Valentine's Day massacre. There is an amazing mixture of light and dark in all of his films.

TERENCE SMITH: Janet, go ahead.

JANET MASLIN: I was just going to say he made a lot of films that covered that kind of range and that not only weren't they like other films of his, they weren't like anything. I don't think you can find much of a precedent for "The Apartment" or for "The Lost Weekend" or, you know, for "Sunset Boulevard," certainly.

TERENCE SMITH: Kevin Lally, you mentioned before, the tension between the hero and the antihero in some of these films. His heroes certainly were flawed characters, very human characters, weren't they?

KEVIN LALLY: And he took a lot of criticism for that. People thought well, he is just being very superficially cynical because very often these cynical anti-heroes had redemption at the end of the film, but he would argue that well how can I show redemption if you don't show what comes before it?

TERENCE SMITH: Janet Maslin, when you look back at his work, was he a writer who directed or a director who wrote?

JANET MASLIN: He was a renaissance man is what he was. He was a filmmaker. He was a complete and total filmmaker who managed to make, I think, really brilliant work in the mainstream of American entertainment, which is harder thing to do than you can imagine.

TERENCE SMITH: And yet Kevin Lally, I think he thought of himself as a writer, did he not?

KEVIN LALLY: I think he would certainly have said that he was first and foremost a writer; that he became a director to protect his words. And indeed, again he was a groundbreaker in that sense because there were very few of his contemporaries who, at that time, made the transition from the screen writing ranks to a successful directing career.

Page 537

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

TERENCE SMITH: Janet Maslin--

JANET MASLIN: What makes you think of him as a director is certain actors who worked for him, when you think of their best performance, it tends to be in his film. He was just a wonderful director of actors. Think of William Holden or Gloria Swanson or Monroe.

KEVIN LALLY: Or Marilyn Monroe's two most celebrated performances.

TERENCE SMITH: He brought out the best. Is that what you are saying?

JANET MASLIN: That's more than what a writer does. That's really into the realm of directing.

TERENCE SMITH: Kevin Lally, his films pushed the edge, as you said before, about alcoholism and the "Lost Weekend" and so forth. Was Hollywood, perhaps, not ready for him when he did some of these things?

KEVIN LALLY: Well, there was-- there were a couple of particular cases when Hollywood wasn't ready there. There was a film in 1951 called "Ace in the Hole" which was loosely based on the Floyd Collins case and it's about a journalist who exploits a situation in which a man is trapped in a cave-in. And it is basically a film about the media's exploitation of a sensational incident. I mean it is extremely timely today, but at the time the public just wasn't ready for this film and indeed a lot of critics weren't ready for it, either.

JANET MASLIN: He took a terrible critical drubbing with a lot of his films. He talked about the fact that Pauline Cale for instance never liked anything he did. He was amused but I'm sure it hurt at the time.

TERENCE SMITH: At one point he and co-author had 14 consecutive hits, not a bad average.

JANET MASLIN: That's the problem. They were hits, you know. If you want to be an esteemed artist, you better not have 14 hits.

TERENCE SMITH: Hits with the audience but not necessarily with the critics.

JANET MASLIN: That's right.

TERENCE SMITH: Kevin Lally, when you look at his work, can you see signs of it or a legacy when you look at other directors today?

KEVIN LALLY: I think his greatest legacy is the sheer craft of his work. If you look at films like "Some Like It Hot" it is like an incredibly efficient machine and a lot of writer directors take their inspiration from the sheer craft - craftsmanship of his work.

TERENCE SMITH: That's terrific. Kevin Lally, Janet Maslin thank you both very much.

RECAP

JIM LEHRER: Again, the major developments of this Friday: Israeli forces

Page 538

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, March 29, 2002

stormed Palestinian leader Arafat's compound in the West Bank. On the NewsHour tonight, a Palestinian official said he spoke to Arafat a short time ago and remained in high morale and an Israeli diplomatic on the NewsHour said Israel was not out to get Arafat. And the U.S. military investigated a possible friendly fire death in Afghanistan. A reminder: "Washington Week" can be seen on most PBS stations later this evening. We'll see you online, and again here Monday evening. Have a nice weekend. I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you and good night.